

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Leo E. Trombly to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 7, with headquarters at Ogdensburg, N. Y.

Clara E. Sarvela, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS

Richard W. McSpedon to be surveyor of customs for customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 31, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Fountain of Courage and Inspiration, increase our faith, and our belief in the eternal goodness of an all-wise God. As we face a new day and a new week, we thank Thee for the blessing and the bounty of work, for the grand essentials of a useful life are something to do, something to love, and something to hope for.

In all our labors, strengthen us with wisdom from above, that we may quit ourselves like men, and Thine shall be the praise. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 27, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2663. An act to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 930) entitled "An act to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a magazine article.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a speech.

LET US BUILD

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, we hear much about communism, fascism, and nazism these days—all three the same

horse, but in different harness. We pass laws to punish them and others who would deprive us of our cherished freedoms. All this is good, but that alone is not enough to assure our success as a nation.

In our concern about these evils, we often overlook the things which will protect us against them better than anything else. We forget that the success of our great system of government will do more than all else to combat those who would do us injury as a people.

To make our system work:

We must strive with all our might to see to it that we have security on the farm.

We must strive with all our might to see to it that every farm home has all the cheap electricity which it can use and afford.

We must strive with all our might to see to it that everyone who has the ambition to do so can own his own farm.

We must strive with all our might to see to it that we have good roads to serve these farms.

We must strive with all our might to see to it that children born in these farm homes along with all other children in America have plenty of good food, warm clothing, and a chance for a good education.

We must strive with all our might to see to it that anyone who has the ambition and capacity to do so can own his own business and a home.

We must strive with all our might to see to it that all who desire to work shall have a chance to work at a living wage throughout the year and have a chance to own a home.

We must strive with all our might to see to it that the religious freedom earned for us by our forefathers spreads its influence from the teachings at our mother's knee into every nook and cranny of the land.

We must strive with all our might to see to it that one of the greatest sources of good government, the ability to get along with people, is fostered and encouraged.

The lack of understanding is the greatest hindrance to peace today. The Russians apparently have decided that they do not want to get along with the rest of the world; that strife serves them in their purposes better than cooperation with other nations.

Likewise, we must strive with all our might to see to it that the farmer, the laborer, and the small-business man get along together because we know well that if either of these three great groups falls into economic distress it means the distress of the other two. All three are so closely interwoven in a delicately balanced process of living with each other in our democracy that constant care must be exercised by each group to preserve that balance.

Our forefathers worked together. The farmer, the merchant, the laborer, all walked and fought in the cold and on bleeding feet at Valley Forge and a hundred battlegrounds to attain our freedom. We, like them, must get along together today if we are to preserve that freedom.

Let us build homes; let us build churches; let us build schools; let us build roads; let us build hospitals; let us build dams; let us build soil; let us build industry; let us build good will; and finally, let us prayerfully build toward a just and lasting peace.

If we do these things, nothing can stop our progress in northwest Arkansas and throughout the Nation as a whole.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Public Lands may have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article from the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. NORRELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter from Dr. Easley.

Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, June 1, I may address the House for 20 minutes following disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including an editorial from yesterday's Times-Herald entitled "Meet Some More Capitalists," and at the end of the editorial I want to add, as part of it because it helps to bring out the purpose of the editorial better, an item entitled "Some 200 Foremen in a Western New York Company Made Up the Following List of How Profits Are Used."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from the Bloomington Pantagraph.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was granted permission to extend his re-

marks in the Appendix of the Record and include certain letters.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record by inserting a resolution adopted by the Kansas conference of Congregational Churches.

APPROPRIATION REFORM ACT OF 1949

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and also to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the financial condition of the Federal Government is most precarious. Our present fiscal dilemma is the result of the failure of this administration to budget intelligently. We are faced with such crude suggestions as the 5 percent over-all appropriations cut, and the unsound Mills corporation tax proposal, because the Democrat leadership failed to budget before it spent. This will always happen if we do not give serious consideration to the economic conditions of the country and their effect upon income and outgo.

For that reason I have today introduced a bill to revise the appropriations machinery of the Congress. I am inserting a statement describing the details of this bill in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. ARE AMERICAN COMMUNISTS DISLOYAL TO THE UNITED STATES?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, an item in the Washington Times-Herald of May 29, 1949, quotes a former president of a State university as saying:

It has not been proved that American Communists are disloyal to the United States, and that liberal thinkers are not convinced that a Communist is necessarily un-American.

Either complete ignorance of the objective of communism and the record of disloyalty of Communists already shown by Government agencies or an attempt to hoodwink and lull the American people into false security can be the source of such a statement.

There cannot be a Communist who is a loyal American, and there cannot be a loyal American who is a Communist.

The one object of communism is the destruction of all free governments, including the United States, by force and bloodshed, if necessary. The two ideologies of government are as far apart as the poles. It is freedom or slavery; there can be no compromise or middle ground with communism.

The granting of an Atomic Energy Commission fellowship to Hans Freistadt, an avowed and admitted Communist, to be paid for by loyal American taxpayers, places the issue squarely before the country. This young Communist from the campus of the University of North Carolina definitely points the direction of Communist thinking when he says:

Our scientists are discriminated against because of their political views. The whole concept of academic freedom is in danger.

He assumes that the Communist Party is a political party. He is 100-percent wrong. It is sheer idiocy and impudent nonsense. It is a brazen fraud. Every Communist is controlled by Russia, and the Communist Party is the fifth column of Russia here and in every other freedom-loving country. It is hostile to our way of life.

Every sensible and loyal American knows that under our philosophy of government the defeat of any one of our political parties in a free election does not mean the end of that party or its political faith. Another day and another chance will come, and their rights are preserved by law.

Is there anyone stupid enough to believe, if the Communist Party should win an election in the United States, that there would ever be another election? All other political faiths would end, their leaders, including all Members of Congress, shot or deported, their property confiscated, and their organizations destroyed.

The American people must be on guard against such rosewater deceit as expressed in the public press a day or two ago, notwithstanding the prominence of its author. That makes his utterance all the more dangerous.

Not \$1 should be spent on educating those who seek the wreck and ruin of our people and the substitution of tyranny for freedom. Mr. Lillenthal has betrayed his country and should be removed at once from public office.

COLUMBIA VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the proposal sponsored by the President which would turn the sovereign States of the Pacific Northwest into a rigidly controlled unit called a Columbia Valley Authority is too radical a departure toward dictatorship to be tolerated even by the Socialist Party. I have occasionally referred to the scheme as socialistic. I have to take that statement back now. At its meeting in Seattle, May 13, the Socialist Party issued a statement condemning the pending CVA bills:

We realize that CVA is a socialistic venture—

Their formal statement says.

The Socialist Party is alarmed at the present rapid trend toward collectivization without democratic controls.

Upon analysis of H. R. 4286, the Mitchell bill, the Socialist Party finds no adequate safeguards to insure democratic control under this measure. It centralizes power in the President and three of his appointees, thereby in some measure justifying the charge of opponents that CVA will be a step in the direction of the authoritarian state.

I never thought the day would come when I could agree with a Socialist statement but I do agree with their statement which I have just quoted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

THE WALTHAM WATCH CO.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a description of the Waltham Watch Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the members of the Massachusetts delegation and others spoke of the plight of the Waltham Watch Co. and the fact that the company had been forced to close down because of foreign competition. It was at the time when the trade agreement bill came up, and we protested allowing over 60 percent of the trade to go to the Swiss companies.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the Waltham Watch Co., thanks to the very cooperative efforts of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is again trying to manufacture. On yesterday, Memorial Day, all the papers in Massachusetts, and the Washington Star here in the District of Columbia, carried articles telling of what the Waltham Watch Co. did in the making of timepieces and precision instruments for the Army, Navy, and the Marine Corps during the war. They performed a very patriotic service, and they are dedicating their new watches to the veteran. These watches are made by Americans—for Americans—in an American plant. The following is the story carried in the papers:

DEDICATED TO THE 12,000,000 MEN AND WOMEN WHO CONSTITUTED AMERICA'S FIGHTING FORCES IN WORLD WAR II: THE VETERAN—THE FIRST OF WALTHAM'S NEW NATIONAL DEFENSE SERIES

The Waltham Watch Co. completes a century of service by introducing a new and magnificent timepiece.

On this Memorial Day, Waltham, a century-old American industry—itsself a veteran of four wars—salutes every American veteran at home, in hospitals, at final rest.

On this Memorial Day, Waltham dedicates and names the first of its 1950 national-defense series the Veteran, in honor of the 12,000,000 men and women who served our country in World War II.

The Veteran is designed in four handsome models, each dedicated to a branch of the United States armed services—the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force. Each is a masterpiece of American precision craftsmanship. Each represents the ultimate in styling and taste.

For 100 years, Waltham's distinguished American timepieces have measured the steady march of American progress. Grave minutes and hours of the Civil War were

weighed by Abraham Lincoln to the solemn ticking of his Waltham watch.

Franklin D. Roosevelt's history-making schedule during World War II was timed by the unfailing accuracy of his American-made Waltham.

During the fateful hours of the war, when skill and dependability were on trial under fire, a vast army of American precision craftsmen at Waltham Watch Co. worked night and day to produce military timepieces, aircraft clocks, compasses, speedometers, fuses, rifle parts. On land, on sea, in the air, America's fighting men depended on Waltham.

Today it is with very real pride, and with a deep sense of gratitude, that the Waltham Watch Co. salutes loyalty and courage at its finest.

The first of Waltham's new national-defense series will honor the man of the century: the veteran.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BARING addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject Making Child Abandonment a Federal Offense.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include remarks he made on the radio last Thursday evening.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 10, 1949, the distinguished Governor of our State, Hon. Sid McMath, made an address before the Interstate Oil Compact Commission at Jacksonville, Fla., on the subject How Conservation Has Encouraged Development in Arkansas, containing some very important and significant statements on the oil policy of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement may be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATING CERTAIN MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 215 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by duly authorized subcommittee or sub-

committees, appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and to make such inquiries as said Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may consider important or pertinent to the merchant marine and fisheries of the United States or any of the Territories thereof, or to any matter coming within the jurisdiction of said committee.

That the committee shall report to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date or dates during the present Congress the results of their studies, investigations, and inquiries, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

The committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within or without the United States whether the Congress is in session, has recessed, or is adjourned; to hold such hearings as it deems necessary; to employ such consultants, specialists, clerks, or other assistants; to travel and authorize its assistants to travel; to utilize such transportation, housing, or other facilities as any governmental agency may make available; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per one hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 12, strike out the word "subpena" and insert the word "subpoena."

Page 2, line 16, after the word "advisable," strike out the balance of the resolution.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire to use.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution just read gives the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries the power of subpoena, in addition to other investigatory powers. These powers have been granted to other legislative committees and I do not know of a committee that is more justified in receiving this additional power than the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, especially in view of its splendid personnel and its chairman who has served at all times with distinction and in the best interest of our country.

The evidence before the Rules Committee as presented by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], is such that I feel there should not be a single vote cast against the resolution. That committee has introduced evidence showing that in the Seventy-ninth Congress an investigation was started which indicated that some \$26,000,000 is owed to the Federal Government through the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration. I feel that this investigation will bring about early action and recovery of that vast sum of money. There are other items and other things also I feel the committee should investigate, namely the overcharges on the part of the

oil companies to the Government involving millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these facts the Rules Committee has unanimously reported this resolution. I am satisfied that after the House hears from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, who will give more background and outline the reasons for this resolution, it will pass without a single vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Rules Committee, has explained, House Resolution 215 gives to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries certain powers, either as a full committee or as a subcommittee, to conduct investigations and studies, to subpoena witnesses, place them under oath, and to compel the production of records.

The resolution was reported unanimously by the Rules Committee. In my opinion, it is of the utmost importance that we give to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries the same power and the same authority to conduct investigations which has been given to almost every other standing committee of the House. The committee is made up of exceptionally able Members of the House. It is headed by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], who has had many years of experience in the work of that committee and has proven himself a very able chairman.

As the gentleman from Illinois explained to you, the authorizing of this investigation is of extreme importance because of the situation which has arisen in connection with many of our merchant-marine problems. It is indicated that if this investigating authority is granted, that the committee will undoubtedly bring about actions which will result in the recovery of huge sums of money into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I forgot to mention it, but I am satisfied that this investigation will bring about the recovery of millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, I am trying to say that the minority agrees fully with the views expressed by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am glad that the gentlemen referred to the type of people that make up this great committee. The make-up of this committee is insurance enough that the powers we propose to give the committee will not be abused.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I fully agree with the gentleman from Georgia, and there is such great confidence in the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman BLAND, and in the membership of the Committee on Merchant Marine and

Fisheries that there is no request for time on this side of the aisle.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I also congratulate the gentleman from Ohio for joining in this investigation. From my viewpoint it is 25 years late. I urged the change in policy with reference to Alaska—and that is what this is directed at—when I came back from that Territory in 1923. There are no fish traps in Canada. All along the Canadian coast we saw hundreds of small fishermen out fishing for a living. But, when it got to Alaska we found large concerns had monopolized the mouths of those streams up which the salmon go on their way to the spawning grounds, and had shut the Alaskan out from the fishing grounds. For that reason I am wholeheartedly in favor of this investigation. The value of the fishery products out of the Alaskan waters amount to more in dollars and cents than the wheat crop in Ohio or the cotton crop in Tennessee, and if those people who live there and make it their permanent home have the same privilege of fishing that they have in Canada, it would be a much more desirable place in which to live.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi very much for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be such unanimous approval of this resolution, that I hope it will be adopted by a unanimous vote, as evidence of the great affection for, and our great confidence in, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], the chairman, and in and for the membership of this committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I feel gratified that the gentleman from Ohio feels as I do in this matter. Therefore, I shall not take up any more time except to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, of course, I am very much in favor of the measure before us. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and also that my distinguished chairman the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] may be given like permission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, it is very gratifying to me and, I am sure, to all of my colleagues on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to hear the warm words just spoken concerning our beloved chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]. The affection which we all feel for him is deep and abiding and needs no further words from me at this time.

I would like, however, to take this opportunity to pay a compliment to the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of which it is my honor to be the chairman. Our schedule of hearings during this Congress has been unusually heavy and it has been necessary for me to ask my members to convene

frequently and for long hours. They have been faithful and loyal and have attacked each problem with the same painstaking care. We have been able to report out many measures which will, I trust, have a far-reaching effect on the fishing industry and on the conservation of our wildlife. The members of this committee are the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WELCH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FUGATE], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PORTER].

May I also express my appreciation at this time for the frequent attendance at our hearings of the distinguished chairman of the main committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], and of the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply indebted to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Ohio Mr. CLARENCE BROWN, of the minority, and other members of the committee and the House for their kindly comments on my work. They have been very generous, and more so than I deserve, but I am deeply grateful nevertheless. I am also very much pleased at the commendations of the work of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I am chairman. All that was said of these other members is absolutely true, and we are all extremely grateful.

House Resolution 215 would authorize and direct the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to conduct full and complete studies and investigations of all matters pertaining to the merchant marine as may be deemed proper.

Although much progress has been made since the termination of hostilities of World War II to the end of returning our American merchant marine to full private ownership and operation in accordance with our national maritime policy, shipping conditions in foreign and domestic commerce are still unsettled and many problems yet remain to be solved before the transition from wartime and emergency status can be completed. This committee has held extensive hearings and reported out proposed legislation relative to the merchant marine and the problems with which it is faced, but the consideration of various legislation during this session with the studies thereon has convinced me that the Congress should take immediate action to study in fullest detail the problems affecting our merchant marine in an earnest effort to aid in the prompt solution of our problems and the correction of all deterrents to our leadership on the seas of the world, and the promotion of world trade, which I consider of

supreme importance to our national economy.

We must, in the interest of national security, study the composition of our foreign and domestic merchant marine, and shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities; the extent and availability of skilled manpower for ship operation, shipbuilding, and ship repair; the effect and nature of competition from foreign shipping; the possibility of the development of a long-range American tramp shipping fleet; the solution on a long-range basis of the problems of the coastwise and intercoastal shipping, including the shipping requirements of the Territory of Alaska; and the proper relationship of the Army and Navy in the conduct of nonmilitary shipping operations. We should study the suggestions of various surveys and studies on the subject of our merchant marine, including the conclusions of the Hoover Commission regarding proposed changes in the Maritime Commission. We should also inquire into the operations of the Merchant Marine Academy and the Coast Guard Academy, to the end that they shall complete their mission in our world leadership. Our committee is charged with the problems affecting the fisheries of the United States and all of the Territories thereof.

I feel that the authority sought in House Resolution 215 is necessary because, among other things, we have been informed in the past several months of the serious and immediate needs of the fisheries of the United States for rehabilitation and development. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is also charged with legislation regarding various problems relative to the Panama Canal, including the very difficult question of a proposed sea-level canal and a terminal-lake canal. The latter proposal involves an estimated cost to the United States of \$3,500,000,000. The investigation also involves many matters of like import as those specifically mentioned which may arise in connection with the various activities under the jurisdiction of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Consequently, we should have available the flexibility of this resolution.

In order to adequately make the studies and investigations which may be required during the remainder of the Eighty-first Congress, I estimate that we should have available a sufficient fund to meet the expense of the members of the committee and its staff, but which will be appropriated as needed. In the past, investigations by this committee have always returned many times the amount appropriated for its use. One of our primary investigatory activities will be to follow up the large sums of uncollected moneys owed by private companies to the Government through the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration. Some progress was made during the Eightieth Congress, but according to recent inquiries made by the Senate Expenditures Committee and newspaper reports, there has been as much as \$26,000,000 uncollected.

It is essential at this time that the Congress review our American merchant marine situation and seek a long-range solution to the many problems which

have presented themselves during the transition period following the war. Today we began hearings to that end and wish to pursue the inquiries deemed necessary. In this the Senate has a similar investigatory resolution and we are working closely with them in order to avoid overlapping investigation. On the other hand, it is necessary that we have the authority hereby requested and necessary funds to perform effectively during the period of our authority. In the past years we have always returned a part of the moneys provided for us. There have been no junketing tours, but industrious studies by day and night, and only such voyages to Alaska and the Panama Canal as were necessary to the proper administration of the responsibilities resting upon the committee.

The matters to be covered in investigations under House Resolution 215 may be summarized briefly as follows:

First. Collection of moneys due the United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration.

Second. Shipbuilding and ship-repair industry.

Third. Manpower, shipbuilding, operation, repair.

Fourth. Foreign competition, ECA, watchdog committee. This involves the maximum use of American ships in foreign trade.

Fifth. Coastwise, intercoastal, and Great Lakes shipping.

Sixth. Alaska shipping problems.

Seventh. Army and Navy in commercial shipping.

Eighth. Reserve fleets.

Ninth. Fisheries resources, rehabilitation, and development.

Tenth. Sea-level Panama Canal.

Eleventh. Merchant Marine and Coast Guard Academies.

Twelfth. Hoover Commission recommendations on Maritime Commission.

Thirteenth. Shipping conferences, their scope and effect.

Fourteenth. Preservation of laid-up fleets for immediate use when needed.

Fifteenth. The maximum use of our merchant marine to promote our trade and to secure, so far as possible, the peace of the world.

Recently, the committee, through the medium of its investigators and a study of other committee records, ascertained that many of the uncollected claims for moneys due the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration had never been billed and additional amounts which had never been analyzed. The amount of these uncollected claims is estimated at about \$26,000,000. Early in this session our staff consulted with the Maritime Commission officials and urged that they take steps to reduce this backlog.

As of March 25, 1949, the Commission staff began to take action and by April 30, 1949, had assigned a total of 50 employees to the work of screening all of the Commission's accounts and billing in all cases where moneys remained due. Since the Commission has had no procedure for keeping track of the amounts billed and collected on account of items in the \$26,000,000 backlog, there is no way of knowing the extent to which such backlog has been reduced. However, at

the instance of the committee's staff, the Commission has agreed to report monthly to the committee staff the state of its progress in collections. Since this procedure was established the Commission as of April 30 issued 241 invoices, amounting to \$362,676.81, of which \$280,884.63 was billed to Government departments and \$81,792.18 was billed to others. As of April 30, \$3,700.75 had been collected from debtors other than Government departments. The claims billed to Government departments represented a variety of interdepartmental transfers for which reimbursement should be made. The items owed by other than governmental departments arose out of various wartime claims against vendors furnishing vessels construction materials. While the results shown in the first month of operation under the present procedure are not impressive, we believe that without constant attention to the problem and insistence upon complete and prompt screening and billing of the Commission's accounts very material progress will show within the next several months.

When there was pending before the Congress recently legislation extending the charter powers of the Commission, Representative CASE of South Dakota attached an amendment to protect a situation which had been brought to the attention of the Appropriations Committee. He has furnished a copy of the testimony before the Appropriations Committee and the matter is now being pursued by our committee staff.

In addition, we have written all members of the Rules Committee asking that our committee staff be supplied with all leads or facts of which they may hear that should be followed by our committee staff and we have great confidence that we may get good results.

In addition, we are soliciting from the present and all former members of the Maritime Commission suggestions as to improvements in Commission procedure or legislation.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 220 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 834) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided

and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 834) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons who contracted to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals and who failed to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes.

As far as I know, there is no controversy over this bill, and I see no purpose in an extended discussion under the rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas has explained, House Resolution 220 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 834. This rule was granted by the Committee on Rules by unanimous vote. The measure was also reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by a unanimous vote. So, seemingly, there is little controversy in connection with the measure. H. R. 834 simply amends the Contract Settlement Act so as to permit the consideration under the provisions of that law, claims against the Government in connection with mining operations to obtain certain strategic materials required by the Government during the war. I believe it was the thought of the Congress when we passed the Contract Settlement Act that it would cover such cases, but seemingly there is some technical question as to whether mining operations and Government contracts therefor are covered. This measure would simply permit such contracts to come under the purview of the original act.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 834) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 834, with Mr. BURLESON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the measure under consideration is similar to one of the series of bills suggested by the Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning as a means of dealing fairly and equitably with that class of contractors who engaged in the war effort. This bill would not be necessary but for the fact that the Contract Settlement Act provides very specifically for the treatment of cases where there has been a formal contract. The type of claimant who will be made whole, if this measure is enacted, is one who did not have a contract, for the most part, and I dare say that 98 percent of the claimants come within the category of being very small operators who were persuaded by the Government to develop mining operations which were of such a nature as not to appeal to such operators unless there was reasonable assurance that the risk would not be too great. These people were persuaded by various Government officials to operate low-producing mines. In many of the cases they were advanced money by the RFC and were given priorities by the War Production Board. As I stated before, it was a very hazardous undertaking which was made necessary because the critical materials they sought were not available due to the stoppage of imports by submarine warfare. These people lost money. The idea underlying this bill is to make them whole, where there has been no speculation and where the losses were not occasioned by mismanagement or negligence. The Committee on the Judiciary feels that it has set up safeguards so that advantage cannot be taken of the United States. In our judgment, it is the only way that equitable relief can be provided for this remaining class of war contractors. Under the Lucas Act, where a contract was terminated, relief was provided for under similar circumstances. It is necessary that this legislation be enacted in order to deal with this class of contractors as we have dealt with every other class of contractors engaged in the war effort.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], chairman of the subcommittee, which held the hearings and gave preliminary consideration to this bill, has stated briefly and concisely the circumstances necessitating this legislation. A similar bill was considered and favorably reported by the Committee on the Judiciary in the Eightieth Congress; however, it was never reached on the calendar. The subcommittee and the full committee in the present Congress unanimously recommend that this bill become law. The observer will note that the bill is technical; yet it is understandable. Possibly I cannot add much to the general explanation; however, I am sure that the committee is prepared to answer all inquiries.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Can the gentleman apprise us of the amount of money involved in this?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, chairman of the subcommittee, if he will be good enough to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to estimate the correct or entire amount involved. We had experience with the same sort of legislation after the last war. I think claims amounting to over \$3,000,000 were paid. It is utterly impossible to estimate the amount that will be claimed.

Mr. MICHENER. The Members will find a most comprehensive committee report accompanying the bill, which was filed on March 2, 1949; therefore, ample time has been given for adequate consideration by the entire membership.

Mr. Chairman, at the risk of repetition, may I state that the purpose of the bill is to compensate persons who, without fault or negligence, suffered losses in attempting to supply certain strategic or critical minerals or metals for the war effort.

During the recent war the need of the Government for certain strategic and critical minerals led to the opening and working of a number of mines which would have been deemed submarginal and uneconomical to operate in normal times. These actions were encouraged by the Government in many ways—the assistance of the Bureau of Mines in the Interior Department in locating mines and determining their probable productivity, the assistance of the War Production Board in granting priority assistance for mining equipment and other needs, and the assistance of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in contracting to buy the product of these mines under announced terms and conditions. There is no doubt in the minds of the committee that most, if not all, of those who would benefit by this bill were induced to engage in the activities resulting in their present losses because of official representations of authorized Government agents.

The committee recognizes that the bill singles out a particular class of war contractors for relief, but feels that such discrimination is well justified. In this thought, the committee is acting not without precedent. Under the Dent Act passed after World War I for the purpose of granting relief to mines, and which contained provisions analogous to, but not as restricted as, the present bill, 1,208 claims were filed as of June 30, 1921. Of these, 1,150 had been acted on by the Government as of that date. Three hundred and seventy-three claims were approved for a total expenditure by the Government of \$3,162,040.75; 770 claims were denied; and 58 remained pending. There is no way of computing the number or monetary value of potential claims under the pending bill. Approximately 11,000 mines were listed on the War Production Board mailing list, and 7,000 of these received priority assistance.

The precedent of the Dent Act only partially predicates the action of the committee. We are also impressed with the harsh results of the manner in which the Government abruptly terminated the program for production of critical min-

erals. The inducements offered by the Government are not contested. Amongst other things, it specified a grade of ore—insofar as manganese was concerned, and the manganese operations are considered to represent the bulk of the losses—that the typical domestic mining property was capable of producing, and offered to accept total production of that or higher grades. Prompted by these inducements, claimants invested heavily in equipping and operating mining sites. Suddenly, about the time the submarine menace in the recent war ended, making accessible the cheaper and higher grade ores in foreign countries, the Government terminated its program by the simple and very effective method of increasing the minimum specification of the ore which they would accept. Automatically, this threw out of business the great majority of manganese miners who found it impossible to meet the increased specifications and who could not afford the expensive and elaborate equipment needed to refine the ore to meet the new specifications. For the most part the men who suffered losses were small, individual operators, who in many cases lost their life savings in their ventures.

There is an essential and fundamental difference between mining operations and operations of other war contractors, such as the manufacturer. The miner cannot be assured of his operation beyond the production of the ore in sight or that which is proven in his mine, plus that doubtful quantity which his experience and judgment leads him to expect. He has all the risks and uncertainties of the manufacturer, such as the fluctuating cost of labor, power, and materials, plus the great risk of exhausting his known ore reserve without being able to find new ones. This risk is even more pronounced in the smaller mines with their more uncertain ore deposits. The exclusion in the bill of so-called speculative ventures must, therefore, be considered in the light of the particular industry, for to some extent all mining ventures are speculative. It is not the intent of this committee that the language in the bill be construed in this restrictive sense.

We further are of the opinion that to deny relief to these claimants would imperil the position of the Government were another emergency to arise requiring immediate supplies of the critical minerals here involved. Niggardly treatment now of their claims would undoubtedly persuade them against reengaging in the same activity in the event they were called upon to do so. The potential loss to the Government in such case cannot be predicted, but any degree of shortage of such vital materials when needed could be disastrous to our welfare.

The committee feels that relief should be granted, on the restricted basis provided by the committee amendment, both to claimants who held formal contracts with the Government or with a war contractor or subcontractors and to those who did not hold such contracts but were induced to engage in the activities in question by representations made by authorized Government agents.

Many of those who held formal contracts for the delivery of fixed amounts

of strategic minerals or metals were unable to complete such contracts for a variety of reasons beyond their control, such as the unforeseen exhaustion of ore bodies of required specifications. In other cases, contracts made for limited quantities were not renewed, leaving claimants with no means of recovering the heavy investment which they had made in the justified belief that the Government's requirements would be such as to result in continued purchases over a more extended period.

It would appear that the Contract Settlement Act does not provide for the reimbursement of losses suffered by claimants with formal contracts falling within these two or certain other categories, since their contracts would not have been "terminated" within the meaning of that act. While the Lucas Act might have been availed of in certain of these cases, it would seem clear that it did not cover all of them. For example, situations in which, even though for reasons beyond the claimant's control, no metals or minerals were actually delivered under a contract would not give rise to a claim under that act; furthermore, the time to file claims under the Lucas Act expired on February 7, 1947.

Many of those who had no formal contracts, and who incurred losses, filed claims under section 17 (a) of the Contract Settlement Act. Some of these were able to establish a "request to proceed" pursuant to that section and have been allowed to recover. Others, however, failed to have their claims allowed by virtue of a ruling of the appeal board in the Office of Contract Settlement that a "request to proceed" must be addressed specifically to the claimant, and a published or posted request addressed to the public at large is not sufficient.

This bill is grounded in justice and those patriotic citizens who during the hour of our distress in the midst of the war were willing to hazard their own fortunes in an effort to comply with the request of their Government, must not now be penalized and bankrupted because conditions concerning the availability of strategic war materials unexpectedly and suddenly changed. I hope that this bill will pass unanimously. I have heard of no opposition.

Mr. Chairman, there are no requests for time on the minority side. I, therefore, reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, in the Eightieth Congress, the Honorable Henderson H. Carson, of Ohio, introduced and sponsored H. R. 4928, which was referred to the House Judiciary Committee, and after extensive hearings and careful deliberations, this committee reported favorably and, with amendments, recommended that the bill be passed. Unfortunately, the report came out late in the closing session and the bill failed to reach the floor in time for a vote.

On January 5, 1949, I introduced H. R. 834, which bill is exactly as reported out by the House Judiciary Committee last year, and my colleagues, the Honorable A. S. J. CARNAHAN, of Missouri, and WIL-

BUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, have introduced similar bills. These bills have also been reported favorably by the House Judiciary Committee with recommendation that they do pass. The report accompanying H. R. 834, submitted by the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, clearly and succinctly states the purpose for which the bill is drawn, the precedent for the committee's action, the need for the relief provided, the basis upon which it is predicated, and, with equal clarity, enumerates the safeguards against exploitation. I want to take this opportunity to commend the committee on the thoroughness of the report and the clarity with which it is rendered and earnestly request that it be read by every Member.

This bill is to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize, belatedly, the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver strategic or critical minerals or metals during the war. The amendment is based upon the repeatedly acknowledged obligation of the American people to provide fair compensation for all who contributed materials, services, or facilities for the prosecution of World War II and is, in substance, a reenactment of similar remedial legislation adopted by the Congress after World War I, expanded to include the minerals and metals designated by the Army and Navy Munitions Board as strategic or critical. The amendment serves to rationalize the payment of fair compensation so that the war contractor who supplied critical minerals and metals is treated the same as any other supplier of materials, services, or facilities used in the prosecution of the war, and to correct presently existing discriminatory practices resulting from technically inconsistent or conflicting provisions of the act itself, whereby the claim of one producer is allowed and that of another is denied.

Commencing with the war-induced emergency, the President of the United States, the Congress, and hundreds of officers and representatives of wartime Government agencies repeatedly importuned the members of the mining fraternity to accelerate exploration, development, and production so that critical minerals and metals used in the manufacture of implements of war might be in maximum supply.

Pursuant to policies formulated by the War Production Board, The Metals Reserve Company, organized in June 1940 to act as a Government purchasing agent, created a special market for critical minerals and metals, and by press, by radio, and by personal appeal, sought to stimulate production by offering all sorts of inducements, such as loans, subsidies, and decentralized special services.

During 1943 and 1944, when the supply of these vital materials became critical, members of the Small Business Committee of the Senate, accompanied by officials or representatives of the MRC, the WPB, and the OPA, visited ore-producing areas practically all over the United States, and at centers like Phoenix, Tucson, and Prescott, Ariz.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Helena and Missoula, Mont.; Spokane and Seattle, Wash.; Las

Vegas, Reno, and Procha, Nev.; Deming, N. Mex., and in ore-producing sections of California, and so forth, the Government's program of stimulation was explained and in person urged upon producers in those respective areas. Every aid and assistance was offered to insure greater mining activity, and the members of the industry were promised a market which would insure a fair return on an investment made in reliance upon these representations.

Purchase depots and stock piles were established in ore-producing areas under the direction and control of MRC agents, opening the buying program to anyone on substantially an unqualified basis. The respective agencies provided throughout the period loans, special prices, preferred markets, priorities, and subsidies. I commend for your reading the hearings before the House Judiciary Committee on March 12 and 19, 1948, on this matter which relates the exact statements that were made by the President of the United States and responsible heads of agencies involved to stimulate this program. I want you to note some examples of the stimuli offered, the personal pressure exerted, and promises made, because here, without doubt, a presently undischarged obligation was created.

The miners' good faith response to the Government's intense drive for increased production we cannot gainsay. Many of those loyal producers, especially from among those of small means, failed to recover the actual costs of their patriotic endeavor, due to natural hazards common to mining and over which the miners had no control, and many of them lost every penny they had.

During the war period, the Government contracting agencies acquired these critical metals and minerals, in three ways: First, different types of contracts, some of which contained settlement provisions, and some of which did not; second, subsidy or premium price plans, providing for payment of costs; and, third, by small-lot purchases direct from the miner at Government depots. I call your attention to these facts primarily to show that, in acquiring critical minerals and metals for the war program, the Government maintained exactly the same contractual relationship with the miners as it did with the manufacturers, and that one is just as much a war contractor as the other.

In 1944 or thereabouts, when the so-called cut-backs in the ore-buying program came, the contracts were terminated or canceled. In every instance termination, either by cancellation or otherwise, was attributable to circumstances over which the producer had no control.

In the meantime, Congress recognized the hardships which had been forced on many war contractors, and in an effort to be fair, passed the Contract Settlement Act which was approved July 1, 1944, the objective of which was to assure final and uniform settlement of claims under all terminated war contracts, and was intended specifically to provide all war contractors with speedy and fair compensation for the termination of their war contracts.

That Congress intended to pay fair compensation to the wartime producer

of critical minerals and metals is evidenced by the words of the Honorable James G. Scrugham, former Senator from Nevada, when he said to a group of miners on August 7, 1944, at Phoenix, Ariz., shortly after the adoption of the Contract Settlement Act:

The Congress had included in the recently passed Contract Settlement Act authority for the Office of Contract Settlement to deal with quasi and informal contracts and make settlements therefor. It was the intent of the Congress under this act to give the agencies and the Office of Contract Settlement such authority that a war minerals relief bill would not be necessary. What the results will be depends upon the administration of the act as set up in the Office of Contract Settlement.

There is no reason, ladies and gentlemen, why you of the mining industry and of other industries who did not wait or quibble about contracts before doing their best for the war effort should not be compensated. I know that I did not intend, and I now know that neither the Senate nor the House intended that we should have to wait 10, 15, or 20 years under some new war minerals relief act before those who may have some unrecovered wartime investment at the end of hostilities should be compensated therefor. This was the case after the last World War.

Unfortunately, history is repeated. Now, nearly 5 years after the passage of the Contract Settlement Act, the record reveals that the miner has been treated with a disregard equal to, or perhaps greater than, that displayed following World War I. Why? Because the contracting agencies upon whom Congress placed the full responsibility for settling terminated war contracts, invoking certain differences between mining and manufacturing operations, necessarily reflected contractually, maintain that the standard mining contract offered by the contracting agencies during the war, and accepted without choice by the miner, is not covered by the language of the Contract Settlement Act. Since the effect of the aforementioned determination by the contracting agencies, upon whose shoulders Congress specifically placed the responsibility for the settlement of termination claims, has, in substance, the force of law, the producer of critical minerals and metals is forced to seek relief through an amendment to Public Law 395.

I have followed rather closely the attitude of the contracting agencies, particularly the RFC, in processing the claims which have been filed. It is clearly evident now that objectives specifically enumerated in the act are being completely nullified by legal technicalities, which cannot be dissolved short of an amendment.

I certainly am not going to engage in an argument involving the legal aspects of controversies relating to the interpretation of certain provisions of the Contract Settlement Act. It is enough for me to know that, when we prepared the act, we intended that the mining contractor, as any other war contractor, was to be paid for loss he might sustain from the withdrawal of markets, or because of representations made to him during the war period, and upon which he in good faith relied. The WPB was designated a contracting agency, due almost entirely to the program of stimulation

which that agency devised and broadcast so that it might respond in terms of fair compensation.

Congress realized that controversies might arise as evidenced by the language of subsection (g) of section 6 which specifically provides that any contract which does not provide for, or provides against, such fair compensation shall be reformed or amended so that it does provide for such fair compensation.

In this bill, we do not disturb the main objectives of the Contract Settlement Act, but only attempt to clarify those legal technicalities which have arisen which seems to nullify the objective specifically enumerated in the act.

The proposed amendment serves, as simply as possible, to remove purely technical obstructions in the act itself, which for almost 5 years have prevented the payment of the fair compensation therein specified to producers of strategic or critical minerals and metals, who, because of the withdrawal of war-induced markets or other circumstances equally beyond their control, failed to recover the actual cost of mining operations entered into during the war period in good faith in response to repeated appeals from the President, Congress, and agencies of the Government, particularly the Metals Reserve Company and WPB. No clear, honest distinction can be drawn between our liability to that class of war contractors and those others to whom, under the authority of the provisions of Public Law 395—the Contract Settlement Act—we have already paid more than \$7,000,000,000.

The amendment to the Contract Settlement Act consists of two parts:

Section 1 of the bill relates to formal contracts under section 6 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, and section 2 provides special treatment of this class of informal contracts under section 17 of the same act.

Section 1 is equipped with protective features selected from and modeled after certain devices employed in the Dent Act, the Lucas Act, and the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 itself. Subsection (h) confines recoveries to actual losses; (h) (1) requires the issuance of regulations within 60 days after enactment; (h) (2) provides that losses should be set off first against any net gains realized by the claimant on his other war contracts with the Government; (h) (3) rules out losses resulting from the negligence or poor management of the claimant, and losses resulting from purely speculative enterprises; (h) (4) requires claims to be filed within 1 year from enactment, and permits recovery of actual losses in excess of any previous settlements of the same claims under the First War Powers Act of 1941, or other provisions of the Contract Settlement Act.

Section 2, relating to informal contracts, contains language protecting the Government from unwarranted elements of recovery similar to those found in section 1, and adds a few additional safeguards designed to meet particular conditions. Subsection (e) (1), in effect, corrects the board of appeals' definition of "request to proceed" by enlarging it to include "any personal, written, or pub-

lished request, demand, solicitation, or appeal—including a published, posted, or oral offer to purchase—from any contracting agency." It requires a good-faith expenditure of money, and confines recovery to net losses. Subsection (e) (2) authorizes the issuance of regulations within 60 days after enactment; (e) (3) repeats the provision of section 1 of the bill concerning restriction of recoverable losses to net losses from all war contracts with the Government; (e) (4) eliminates speculative losses and losses attributable to claimant's fault, negligence, or mismanagement; (e) (5) requires affirmative showing by claimant that he had reasonable cause to believe the property contained minerals in sufficient quantities to be of importance to the Government's procurement program at the time, and this relates itself to the time in question during the war and not to the present aspect of its importance; (e) (6) provides the priorities assistance from War Production Board, if not based solely upon claimant's uncorroborated representations, will constitute the sufficient reason mentioned in the preceding subsection (e) (5); (e) (7) requires claims to be filed within 1 year from enactment and permits recovery of net losses in excess of previous settlements for the same claims under the First War Powers Act of 1941, or other provisions of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

This amendment should be adopted because we owe these producers a debt, the real consideration for which stems from representations and warranties made to them during the war. Again I want to compliment the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, under the able leadership of the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER, which has so clearly and succinctly stated in their report the real purpose for which this bill is drawn. I specifically want to call your attention to the statement on page 3 of the report:

We further are of the opinion that to deny relief to these claimants would imperil the position of the Government were another emergency to arise requiring immediate supplies of the critical minerals here involved. Niggardly treatment now of their claims would undoubtedly persuade them against reengaging in the same activity in the event they were called upon to do so. The potential loss to the Government in such case cannot be predicted, but any degree of shortage of such vital materials when needed could be disastrous to our welfare.

I am certain that you will agree that the situation which prompted these observations is becoming progressively more acute, and that more and more planners or our armament program have been rendered conscious of what might easily become a national calamity. The past year has witnessed an ever-increasing interest in the demand for the creation and maintenance of Government stock piles of these strategic materials. We must not place our dependency on foreign supply; in the future as never before, that source may be completely foreclosed.

These people should be paid fair compensation for past efforts; we will need their aid and assistance in the future.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of that committee for bringing this bill before the House. There are many small mine operators in my district who will be bankrupt except for the help they may get from this bill as a reward for their patriotic war efforts. I heartily approve of the bill. It is just and fair and I hope will be adopted without opposition.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8 (d), section 24, and section 25, of this act, any person who, in good faith entered into a formal contract to deliver, or to arrange to deliver, within specified periods of time, to a contracting agency or to a war contractor, specified quantities of a mineral or metal declared by the Army and Navy Munitions Board, during the emergency proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939, to be strategic or critical, and in completing, or attempting to complete, his contract failed to recover his reasonable costs, including net capital expenditures, shall be paid fair compensation in an amount equal to the net loss so incurred: *Provided, That—*

"(1) the amount of reimbursement under this subsection shall be computed in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President within 60 days after enactment of this subsection based upon such recognized commercial accounting practices as are fair and equitable to the claimants hereunder;

"(2) in arriving at a fair and equitable settlement of claims under this subsection, the respective departments and agencies shall not allow any amount in excess of the amount of the net loss (less the amount of any relief granted subsequent to the establishment of such loss) on all contracts and subcontracts held by the claimant under which work, supplies, or services were furnished for the Government between September 8, 1939, and August 14, 1945, and shall consider with respect to such contracts and subcontracts (i) action taken under the Renegotiation Act (50 U. S. C., Supp. IV, app., sec. 1191), under the other provisions of this act, or similar legislation; (ii) relief granted under section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, or otherwise; and (iii) relief proposed to be granted by any other department or agency under this act;

"(3) no compensation shall be paid under this subsection for expenditures attributable to the fault, negligence, or mismanagement of the claimant, or for expenditures made for merely speculative purposes;

"(4) claims for losses shall not be considered unless filed with the department or agency concerned within 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection. A previous settlement under the First War Powers Act, 1941, or the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 shall not operate to preclude further relief otherwise allowable under this subsection."

Sec. 2. Section 17 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) (1) All claimants who, in response to any personal, written, or published request, demand, solicitation, or appeal (including a published, posted, or oral offer to purchase) from any contracting agency, in good faith expended money in producing or preparing

to produce any minerals or metals declared by the Army and Navy Munitions Board during the emergency proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939, to be strategic or critical, shall be paid by the contracting agency fair compensation for such net losses as they may have incurred.

"(2) The amount of reimbursement under this subsection shall be limited to amounts expended between September 16, 1940, and August 14, 1945, and shall be computed in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President within 60 days after enactment of this subsection based upon such recognized commercial accounting practices as are fair and equitable to the claimants hereunder.

"(3) In arriving at a fair and equitable settlement of claims under this subsection, the respective departments and agencies shall not allow any amount in excess of the amount of the net loss (less the amount of any relief granted subsequent to the establishment of such loss) on all claims, contracts, and subcontracts, if any, under which work, supplies, or services were furnished for the Government, or moneys were expended by the claimant, between September 8, 1939, and August 14, 1945, and shall consider with respect to such contracts and subcontracts (i) action taken under the Renegotiation Act (50 U. S. C., Supp. IV, app., sec. 1191), under the other provisions of this act, or similar legislation; (ii) relief granted under section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, or otherwise; and (iii) relief proposed to be granted by any other department or agency under this act.

"(4) No compensation shall be paid under this subsection for expenditures attributable to the fault, negligence, or mismanagement of the claimant, or for expenditures made for merely speculative purposes.

"(5) No compensation shall be paid under this subsection unless it shall affirmatively appear that the losses so incurred were incurred on property which the claimant had reasonable cause to believe contained strategic or critical minerals or metals in sufficient quantities to be of importance to the procurement program of the Government at the time.

"(6) Authorization by the War Production Board or any of its predecessor agencies for procurement of articles or materials to be used by the claimant in connection with the production of strategic or critical minerals or metals shall constitute sufficient reason for belief on the part of the claimant that the property contained strategic or critical minerals or metals in sufficient quantities to be of importance to the procurement program of the Government at the time, except where the authorization was based solely upon uncorroborated representations of the claimant.

"(7) Claims for losses shall not be considered unless filed with the department or agency concerned within 1 year after the date of approval of this subsection. A previous settlement under the First War Powers Act, 1941, or the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 shall not operate to preclude further relief otherwise allowable under this subsection."

Mr. WALTER (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill may be dispensed with and that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Page 6, line 6, after line 6 insert a new subsection (8):

"*Provided, That nothing in this act shall have any application to any claims now being litigated between Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any Government contracting agency upon the one side and any contractor on the other.*"

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is merely to provide a saving clause that will preclude any possibility whatsoever of the application of this bill as now written, to litigation now pending between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any Government agency and any contractor with such agency.

I am particularly concerned with a claim or dispute between the Monolith Portland Midwest Co. and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The facts are about as follows:

Shortly after the entry of the United States in World War II the aluminum-supply situation became critical.

As a result of the insecure position of the United States during the early part of the war in the aluminum field, four experimental plants were authorized by the War Production Board to test the feasibility of producing alumina from domestic sources of aluminum-bearing raw materials other than bauxite. Three of these plants had been completed and short trial runs made of the various processes. However, the fourth one, which is located at Laramie, Wyo., was only about 90 percent completed, with no trial operation thereof being made at the time the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in 1946, canceled the contract for its completion and operation.

The process developed by the Monolith Portland Midwest Co. uses anorthosite, from which the alumina is extracted and the remainder is a good Portland cement raw material. The deposits in Wyoming near the plant cover hundreds of thousands of acres and would provide a supply of alumina for the world's use for generations. It is believed that the Monolith plant and process at Laramie, Wyo., can economically use all of the raw materials entering therein for the production of alumina and portland cement.

Inasmuch as the United States has less than 5 percent of the known proven supply of bauxite in the world, it is believed to be sound policy to find a substitute for this strategic material.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation terminated its contract with Monolith on the ground that the experiment was no longer in the public interest. Monolith was forced to bring suit against the RFC in the Federal District Court of California. The court ordered that the status quo of the plant and assets remain unchanged until a determination could be made of the obligations of the RFC, and the plant therefore is intact in every respect and could be placed in operation in a short time.

It is Monolith's position that the provisions of the Contract Settlement Act are optional. That is to say, that an aggrieved contractor may take either course in the adjudication of his rights by either

complying with the Contract Settlement Act regulations or bring action in any court of competent jurisdiction.

I have discussed this amendment with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] and with the author of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], and I am certain there is no objection to this amendment which merely preserves the rights of a party in pending litigation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, the purpose is to make it certain that no technical objections can be raised in the court in a case that is now in the court. The purpose of the amendment is to make it abundantly plain that it is the intention of Congress to give to those people the same equitable relief that anybody else may have under the provisions of the law.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. That is right.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. It is not the intention of this legislation to affect existing litigation. I do not think it would, and I do not think the gentleman's amendment will harm the bill at all, but will make abundantly clear the fact that that is not our intention. As the author of the bill, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURLESON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 834) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 220, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SIMS, through June 8, on account of illness.

To Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, for the week of May 30, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pecos River compact.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 26, 1949, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3704. An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 1, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

657. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to stabilize farm income and farm prices of agricultural commodities; to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce; and for other purposes," was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4332. A bill to amend the National Bank Act and the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 976. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 709). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2610. A bill to include in section 3 of the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), the Midwakanton Sioux Indians of the State of Minnesota; with an amendment (Rept. No. 710). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2783. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land, with improvements, to the city of Alpena, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. S. 353. An act to protect scenic values along and tributary to Aspen Basin Road, and contiguous scenic area, within the Santa Fe National Forest, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2634. A bill to provide transportation of passengers and merchandise on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; with an amendment (Rept. No. 713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1446. A bill for the relief of Conrad L. Wirth; without amendment (Rept. No. 695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1505. A bill for the relief of Harry Warren; with an amendment (Rept. No. 696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1701. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vesta Meinn and Mrs. Edna Williams; with an amendment (Rept. No. 697). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2471. A bill for the relief of Walt W. Rostow; with an amendment (Rept. No. 698). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4097. A bill for the relief of George M. Beesley, Edward D. Sexton, and Herman J. Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 699). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4792. A bill for the relief of Harry Fuchs; without amendment (Rept. No. 700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4807. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Atlas; without amendment (Rept. No. 701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1127. A bill for the relief of Sirkka Siiri Saarelainen; without amendment (Rept. No. 702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1466. A bill for the relief of Daniel Kim; with an amendment (Rept. No. 703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1625. A bill for the relief of Christine Kono; with an amendment (Rept. No. 704). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1975. A bill for the relief of Rudolf A. V. Raff; with an amendment (Rept. No. 705). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2084. A bill for the relief of Teiko Horikawa and Yoshiko Horikawa; with an amendment (Rept. No. 706). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2709. A bill for the relief of Sadae Aoki; without amendment (Rept. No. 707). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 4908. A bill making the 14th day of August in each year a legal holiday, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4909. A bill to provide Members of Congress with more timely and comprehensive knowledge of the appropriations and expenditures needed for the functional operations of the Government, to promote efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 4910. A bill to relieve taxpayers from the payment of interest on deferred payments under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4911. A bill to provide for review by courts of the United States of determinations under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS (by request):

H. R. 4912. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide an alternative method of financing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 4913. A bill to authorize the construction of the Klickitat unit of the Wapato project, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 4914. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, being Public Law No. 101, Eightieth Congress; to protect the right of parties to labor contracts to organize to bargain collectively; to protect the right of members of such organizations to govern their said organizations; to protect the public health and safety, as distinguished from public convenience; to provide additional facilities for the mediation and conciliation of labor disputes, all in all cases affecting commerce; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 4915. A bill to amend the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1086; 43 U. S. C., sec. 36b), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for the Geological Survey"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4916. A bill to exempt from stock-transfer tax transfers between a corporation and its nominee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 4917. A bill to provide transportation for certain persons to the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 4918. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 4919. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 4920. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 4921. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 4922. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 4923. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4924. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 4925. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 4926. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 4927. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 4928. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 4929. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 4930. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4931. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

973. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Jersey City Junior Chamber of Commerce, urging repeal of the transportation tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

974. Also, petition of Gen. Joseph Wheeler Post, No. 62, VFW, urging that an investigation of David Lillenthal and the Atomic Energy Commission be undertaken; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

975. By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma (for himself and the Oklahoma delegation in Congress): Memorial of the Oklahoma State House of Representatives, memorializing Congress to take all possible necessary action to alleviate the serious hazard to health caused by the prevalence throughout a large part of the United States of ticks; to the Committee on Interstate Foreign Commerce.

976. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Robert J. Frazier and others, Walla Walla, Wash., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

977. Also, petition of Mrs. M. L. Norton and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

978. Also, petition of P. Marion Kissans and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

979. Also, petition of A. A. MacDonald, clerk, City of Cincinnati Council, Cincinnati, Ohio, urging favorable consideration of H. R. 3824; to the Committee on Public Works.

980. Also, petition of Pearl L. Curry and others, Walla Walla, Wash., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

981. Also, petition of Mrs. Willie Miller and others, Mitchell, S. Dak., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

982. Also, petition of Mrs. A. Bruner and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

983. Also, petition of Fred Correll and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

984. Also, petition of Mrs. M. L. Morse and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

985. Also, petition of Mrs. Mabel Norton, St. Petersburg Townsend Club, No. 1, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.